

**Remarks**

The above amendments and these remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed October 31, 2008.

**I. Summary of Examiner's Rejections**

Claims 1, 2, 5-9, 12, 13, 16-20, 29, and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Kampe et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,854,069, hereinafter Kampe).

**II. Summary of Applicant's Response**

The present Reply amends claims 1, 12, and 29; leaving for the Examiner's present consideration claims 1, 2, 5-9, 12, 13, 16-20, 29, and 30. Reconsideration of the claims is requested.

**III. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)**

Claim 1 has been amended to define a Java-based cluster server executing on a Java virtual machine on a computer. Applicant respectfully submits that Kampe discloses a system that operates on an operating system and relies upon providing platform-dependent extensions to the operating system. (Col. 5, line 60 – Col. 6, lines 2). In contrast, claim 1 defines a Java-based cluster server executing on a Java virtual machine. As described by Applicant in the detailed description, the Java virtual machine platform provides superior benefits from traditional high availability framework offerings in that it is not vendor-centric and is not tied to any underlying hardware or operating system platform. (Paragraph [0044]). In contrast, the system disclosed by Kampe does not appear to execute on a Java virtual machine; but instead appears to rely upon the operating system and platform dependent extensions to the operating system. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Kampe does not disclose a Java-based cluster server executing on a Java virtual machine on a computer.

Claim 1 further defines a JNDI interface provided by said Java-based cluster server that provides an interface between the Java-based cluster server and a JNDI-compliant database. Kampe appears to be silent regarding these features. Applicant respectfully submits that Kampe does not disclose a JNDI interface provided by said Java-based cluster server that provides an interface between the Java-based cluster server and a JNDI-compliant database.

Claim 1 further defines that the Java-based cluster server allows an application to access a set of resources of various resource types, including application servers and transaction processing systems. Claim 1 further defines a resource interface provided by said Java-based cluster server that provides an

- 6 -

abstraction layer and allows the Java-based cluster server to receive uniform requests from the application and communicate the requests to said set of resources. Claim 1 further defines a plurality of plugins that are plugged into the resource interface to provide a set of application-specific callbacks from the Java-based cluster server to the set of resources, wherein the system includes a plugin for each resource type, and wherein each plugin implements a resource API to encapsulate its particular resource type-specific behavior. In the Office Action, it was asserted that Kampe discloses that component integration services include standard management and service methods that may be provided by plug-in components (e.g. device drivers, protocols, applications, etc.) to facilitate the addition of new components to a system. (Col. 5, lines 35-40). However, while Kampe appears to disclose that integration services may enable additional components to be added to a system, Kampe does not appear to disclose allowing an application to access a set of resources of various resource types, including application servers and transaction processing systems. Furthermore, Kampe does not appear to disclose a plurality of plugins that are plugged into a resource interface to provide a set of application-specific callbacks from a Java-based cluster server to a set of resources, as defined by claim 1.

In view of the comments provided above, Applicant respectfully submits that the embodiment defined by claim 1, as amended, is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

#### **Claims 12 and 29**

The comments provided above with respect to claim 1 are hereby incorporated by reference. Claims 12 and 29 have been similarly amended by the current Reply to more clearly define the embodiments therein. For similar reasons as provided above with respect to Claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 12 and 29, as amended, are likewise neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

#### **Claims 2, 5-9, 13, 16-20, and 30**

Claims 2, 5-9, 13, 16-20, and 30 depend from and include all of the features of Claims 1, 12, or 29. Claims 2, 5-9, 13, 16-20, and 30 are not addressed separately, but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the amendments to the independent claims, and the comments provided above. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Application No: 10/693,137  
Office Action mailed: October 31, 2008  
Reply to Office Action dated: December 31, 2008

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

DEC 31 2008

IV. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 31, 2008

By: /Thomas K. Plunkett/  
Thomas K. Plunkett  
Reg. No. 57,253

Customer No.: 80548  
FLIESLER MEYER LLP  
650 California Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California 94108  
Telephone: (415): 362-3800